

REMARKS

Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-4 and 10-13

Claims 1-4 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mochida, U.S. Patent No. 6,462,744 (previously cited). Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1-4 and 10-13 is not anticipated by Mochida.

Mochida discloses an onscreen data video display system that determines which portions of a B frame will be replaced by the location and size of the onscreen data, and discards those pre-determined portions before decoding the video. In addition, Mochida discloses that using B frames can degrade the video picture quality. Mochida also discloses that the remaining portions of the B frame are scaled using horizontal filters 71 and 72 (Figure 8). Vertical filter 73 receives the scaled output from horizontal filters 71-71 and filters between the video lines (Figure 8). However, Mochida does not teach or suggest that vertical filter 73 performs scaling.

Applicant's claimed pre-determined portions of the B frame are determined by display resolution. In contrast, Mochida's pre-determined portions are determined by the picture quality. Furthermore, the section cited by the Examiner as disclosing Applicant's claimed scaling of the pre-determined portions merely discloses the effect the number of B frames has on the decoded picture quality. Therefore, Mochida cannot be properly interpreted as disclosing Applicant's pre-determined portions as claimed. Furthermore, Applicant claims that vertical filtering is used to scale the pre-determined portions of the B frame, while Mochida discloses only using horizontal filtering to scale the pre-determined portions.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed in claims 1-4 and 10-13 is not anticipated by Mochida under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 9, 14 and 15

Claims 5, 9, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida in view of Reitmeier, U.S. Patent No. 4,622,577 (previously cited). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 5, 9, 14 and 15.

Reitmeier does not disclose decoding only portions of B-frames determined by display resolution, or the scaling of the pre-determined portions using vertical filtering as claimed. Because Mochida does not teach or suggest these claimed elements, the combination of Mochida and Reitmeier cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 5, 9, 14 and 15.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 16, 21, 22 and 25

Claims 16, 21, 22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida in view of Boyce, U.S. Patent No. 5,614,952 (previously cited). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 16, 21, 22 and 25.

Boyce does not disclose decoding only portions of B-frames determined by display resolution, or the scaling of the pre-determined portions using vertical filtering as claimed. Because Mochida does not teach or suggest these claimed elements, the combination of Mochida and Boyce cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 16, 21, 22 and 25.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 6, 17-20, 23 and 26-33

Claims 6, 17-20, 23 and 26-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida in view of Reitmeier and Boyce. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Mochida, Reitmeier and Boyce does not teach or suggest each

and every limitation of Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 6, 17-20, 23 and 26-33.

None of the three references teach or suggest decoding only portions of B-frames determined by display resolution, or the scaling of the pre-determined portions using vertical filtering as claimed. Therefore, the combination cannot be properly interpreted as doing so.

Therefore, the combination of Mochida, Reitmeier and Boyce cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 6, 17-20, 23 and 26-33, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 8, 24 and 34

Claims 8, 24 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida in combination of Official Notice that MPEG-2 is well known. However, Mochida does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 8, 24 and 34, and the assertion of Official Notice cannot fill the gaps. Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 8, 24 and 34, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-34 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300 x258.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: Apr. 11, 2004



Eric S. Replogle
Registration No. 52,161

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300